

said plurality of data elements stored therein in the order in which said plurality of said data elements are listed in said resource file.

REMARKS

Applicant's agent wishes to express his thanks to Examiner Amsbury for the courtesy extended him in discussing this application during the telephone conversations conducted on July 16, and August 4, 1997.

The office action contains an indication of allowance of claims 10-12. The office action further contains a rejection of claims 2-9, 13 and 14, and an objection to claims 15-20. Finally, the Examiner indicates in the office action that claims 4-9 and 15-20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

In the office action, the Examiner points out that claim 4 recites the limitation "said application said program", and that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation. Responsive to the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, Claim 4 is cancelled herewith, rendering this objection moot.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated "... by virtually any computerized method of sorting published prior to June 7, 1994." Claim 2 is cancelled herewith, thereby rendering this objection moot.

Claims 2-3 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,487,628. Claims 2-3 and 13-14 are cancelled herewith, thereby rendering this objection moot.

Claim 21 is presented herewith to accept the Examiner's kind suggestion of allowability of Claim 4 by rewriting the latter claim in independent form incorporating all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5-9 are also amended herewith to reflect their changed dependency on newly presented Claim 21. Claim 5 is further amended to more clearly point out and distinctly claim the invention which Applicant has made by reciting the step of "...executing said application program accessing said second data file." in place of the former language reciting "... said application program, whereby said application program accesses said second data file."

Claim 22 is presented herewith to accept the Examiner's kind suggestion of allowability


4

of Claim 15 by rewriting the latter claim in independent form incorporating all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 16-20 are also amended herewith to reflect their changed dependency on newly presented Claim 22.

Applicant notes that the Examiner makes of record, but does not rely upon United States Patent Numbers: 4,760,526 to Takeda et al.; 5,193,207 to Vander Vegt et al.; 5,274,805; to Ferguson et al.; 5,414,842 to Archer et al.; and 5,592,669 to Robinson et al..

Claims 5-12 and 15-22 are in the application. Applicant has noted all the art made of record. Applicant believes, however, that the claimed invention provides new, useful and unobvious features and advantages over the cited references of record, and that the claims are drawn to patentable subject matter which is patentable to him. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests continued examination and early allowance of all claims. The Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned to resolve any matter which would tend to delay the early allowance of any claim pending in this matter. Favorable action is accordingly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Howard E. Morton

Pat. Reg. No. 37,401

HEM:ipp
August 4, 1997
LaRiviere, Grubman & Payne
P.O. Box 3140
Monterey, CA 93942
408-649-8800